

Tanya E. Moore, SBN 206683  
MOORE LAW FIRM, P.C.  
300 South First Street, Ste. 342  
San Jose, California 95113  
Telephone (408) 298-2000  
Facsimile (408) 298-6046  
E-mail: service@moorelawfirm.com  
tanya@moorelawfirm.com

Attorney for Plaintiff  
Jose Trujillo

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

JOSE TRUJILLO,

Plaintiff,

vs.

TACO RIENDO INC.; RICHARD W.  
ANDERSON, JR.;

Defendants.

) No.  
)  
) **COMPLAINT ASSERTING DENIAL OF**  
) **RIGHT OF ACCESS UNDER THE**  
) **AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT**  
) **FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF, DAMAGES,**  
) **ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS (ADA)**

**I. SUMMARY**

1. This is a civil rights action by plaintiff JOSE TRUJILLO ("Plaintiff") for discrimination at the building, structure, facility, complex, property, land, development, and/or surrounding business complex known as:

Taco Riendo  
235 West Inyo Avenue  
Tulare, California 93274  
(hereafter "the Facility")

2. Plaintiff seeks damages, injunctive and declaratory relief, attorney fees and costs, against TACO RIENDO INC. and RICHARD W. ANDERSON, JR. (hereinafter collectively referred to as "Defendants"), pursuant to Title III of the Americans with

1 Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. §§ 12101 et seq.) (“ADA”) and related California statutes.

2 **II. JURISDICTION**

3 3. This Court has original jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343 for ADA  
4 claims.

5 4. Supplemental jurisdiction for claims brought under parallel California law –  
6 arising from the same nucleus of operative facts – is predicated on 28 U.S.C. § 1367.

7 5. Plaintiff’s claims are authorized by 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202.

8 **III. VENUE**

9 6. All actions complained of herein take place within the jurisdiction of the United  
10 States District Court, Eastern District of California, and venue is invoked pursuant to 28 U.S.C.  
11 § 1391(b), (c).

12 **IV. PARTIES**

13 7. Defendants own, operate, and/or lease the Facility, and consist of a person (or  
14 persons), firm, and/or corporation.

15 8. Plaintiff is substantially limited in his ability to walk, and uses a wheelchair or  
16 cane for mobility. In addition, Plaintiff’s hearing is substantially limited. Consequently,  
17 Plaintiff is “physically disabled,” as defined by all applicable California and United States  
18 laws, and a member of the public whose rights are protected by these laws.

19 **V. FACTS**

20 9. The Facility is open to the public, intended for non-residential use, and its  
21 operation affects commerce. The Facility is therefore a public accommodation as defined by  
22 applicable state and federal laws.

23 10. Plaintiff lives less than fifteen miles from the Facility and visited the Facility on  
24 or about July 26, 2021 to have dinner. During his visit to the Facility, Plaintiff encountered the  
25 following barriers (both physical and intangible) that interfered with, if not outright denied,  
26 Plaintiff’s ability to use and enjoy the goods, services, privileges and accommodations offered  
27 at the Facility:

28 a) Plaintiff could not find any designated accessible parking stalls in the

1 Facility's parking lot, and had to park in a standard parking stall that  
2 lacked an access aisle. Upon arrival, Plaintiff needed assistance from his  
3 daughter to transfer from his vehicle to his wheelchair because the  
4 surface of the parking lot was uneven, causing his wheelchair to move  
5 and his wheels to get stuck in the large cracks. Upon leaving the  
6 Facility, he found another vehicle parked next to him which did not  
7 allow sufficient clear space for him to transfer from his wheelchair back  
8 into his vehicle. Plaintiff had to wait for the other patron to return to  
9 their vehicle, which was frustrating and humiliating.

10 b) The path of travel from the parking area to the Facility entrance was  
11 uneven, with excessive slopes and height changes, and lacked sufficient  
12 clear width, making it difficult for Plaintiff to maneuver.

13 c) The Facility entrance door was heavy and difficult for Plaintiff to open,  
14 and there was an excessive slope at the exterior landing which  
15 compounded the difficulty.

16 d) The threshold at the Facility entrance was too high, and there was an  
17 uneven transition from the cement to the interior of the floor, which  
18 made it difficult for Plaintiff to wheel through the doorway.

19 e) Plaintiff could not find any accessible tables at the Facility. He had to sit  
20 at a table which was too low, and it lacked sufficient knee clearances for  
21 his wheelchair. He was required to sit at an awkward angle and distance  
22 from the table while eating, which was difficult and uncomfortable.

23 f) The transaction counter was too high, making it difficult for Plaintiff to  
24 pay for his meal. He could not see the prompts on the point-of-sale  
25 device because it was too high, and he had to flip the device on its side  
26 to be able to see the prompts, which was embarrassing. Although  
27 employees saw him struggling, they did not offer any assistance, nor did  
28 they offer to help carry Plaintiff's food to the table.

1           11. The barriers identified in paragraph 10 herein are only those that Plaintiff is  
2 presently aware of. Plaintiff is presently unaware of other barriers which may in fact exist at  
3 the Facility and relate to his disabilities. Plaintiff will seek to amend this Complaint once such  
4 additional barriers are identified as it is Plaintiff's intention to have all barriers which exist at  
5 the Facility and relate to his disabilities removed to afford him full and equal access.

6           12. Plaintiff was, and continues to be, deterred from visiting the Facility because  
7 Plaintiff knows that the Facility's goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, and  
8 accommodations were and are unavailable to Plaintiff due to Plaintiff's physical disabilities.  
9 Plaintiff enjoys the goods and services offered at the Facility, and will return to the Facility  
10 once the barriers are removed.

11           13. Defendants knew, or should have known, that these elements and areas of the  
12 Facility were inaccessible, violate state and federal law, and interfere with (or deny) access to  
13 the physically disabled. Moreover, Defendants have the financial resources to remove these  
14 barriers from the Facility (without much difficulty or expense), and make the Facility  
15 accessible to the physically disabled. To date, however, Defendants refuse to either remove  
16 those barriers or seek an unreasonable hardship exemption to excuse non-compliance.

17           14. At all relevant times, Defendants have possessed and enjoyed sufficient control  
18 and authority to modify the Facility to remove impediments to wheelchair access and to  
19 comply with the 1991 ADA Accessibility Guidelines and/or the 2010 ADA Standards for  
20 Accessible Design. Defendants have not removed such impediments and have not modified the  
21 Facility to conform to accessibility standards. Defendants have intentionally maintained the  
22 Facility in its current condition and have intentionally refrained from altering the Facility so  
23 that it complies with the accessibility standards.

24           15. Plaintiff further alleges that the (continued) presence of barriers at the Facility is  
25 so obvious as to establish Defendants' discriminatory intent. On information and belief,  
26 Plaintiff avers that evidence of this discriminatory intent includes Defendants' refusal to adhere  
27 to relevant building standards; disregard for the building plans and permits issued for the  
28 Facility; conscientious decision to maintain the architectural layout (as it currently exists) at the

1 Facility; decision not to remove barriers from the Facility; and allowance that Defendants’  
2 property continues to exist in its non-compliant state. Plaintiff further alleges, on information  
3 and belief, that the Facility is not in the midst of a remodel, and that the barriers present at the  
4 Facility are not isolated or temporary interruptions in access due to maintenance or repairs.

5 **VI. FIRST CLAIM**

6 **Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990**

7 Denial of “Full and Equal” Enjoyment and Use

8 16. Plaintiff re-pleads and incorporates by reference the allegations contained in  
9 each of the foregoing paragraphs, and incorporates them herein as if separately re-pled.

10 17. Title III of the ADA holds as a “general rule” that no individual shall be  
11 discriminated against on the basis of disability in the full and equal enjoyment (or use) of  
12 goods, services, facilities, privileges, and accommodations offered by any person who owns,  
13 operates, or leases a place of public accommodation. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(a).

14 18. Defendants discriminated against Plaintiff by denying Plaintiff “full and equal  
15 enjoyment” and use of the goods, services, facilities, privileges and accommodations of the  
16 Facility during each visit and each incident of deterrence.

17 Failure to Remove Architectural Barriers in an Existing Facility

18 19. The ADA specifically prohibits failing to remove architectural barriers, which  
19 are structural in nature, in existing facilities where such removal is readily achievable. 42  
20 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv).

21 20. When an entity can demonstrate that removal of a barrier is not readily  
22 achievable, a failure to make goods, services, facilities, or accommodations available through  
23 alternative methods is also specifically prohibited if these methods are readily achievable. *Id.*  
24 § 12182(b)(2)(A)(v).

25 21. Here, Plaintiff alleges that Defendants can easily remove the architectural  
26 barriers at the Facility without much difficulty or expense, that the cost of removing the  
27 architectural barriers does not exceed the benefits under the particular circumstances, and that  
28 Defendants violated the ADA by failing to remove those barriers, when it was readily

1 achievable to do so.

2 22. In the alternative, if it was not “readily achievable” for Defendants to remove  
3 the Facility’s barriers, then Defendants violated the ADA by failing to make the required  
4 services available through alternative methods, which are readily achievable.

5 Failure to Design and Construct an Accessible Facility

6 23. Plaintiff alleges on information and belief that the Facility was designed and  
7 constructed (or both) after January 26, 1993 – independently triggering access requirements  
8 under Title III of the ADA.

9 24. The ADA also prohibits designing and constructing facilities for first occupancy  
10 after January 26, 1993, that aren’t readily accessible to, and usable by, individuals with  
11 disabilities when it was structurally practicable to do so. 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(1).

12 25. Here, Defendants violated the ADA by designing and constructing (or both) the  
13 Facility in a manner that was not readily accessible to the physically disabled public –  
14 including Plaintiff – when it was structurally practical to do so.<sup>1</sup>

15 Failure to Make an Altered Facility Accessible

16 26. Plaintiff alleges on information and belief that the Facility was modified after  
17 January 26, 1993, independently triggering access requirements under the ADA.

18 27. The ADA also requires that facilities altered in a manner that affects (or could  
19 affect) its usability must be made readily accessible to individuals with disabilities to the  
20 maximum extent feasible. 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(2). Altering an area that contains a facility’s  
21 primary function also requires making the paths of travel, bathrooms, telephones, and drinking  
22 fountains serving that area accessible to the maximum extent feasible. Id.

23 28. Here, Defendants altered the Facility in a manner that violated the ADA and  
24 was not readily accessible to the physically disabled public – including Plaintiff – to the  
25 maximum extent feasible.

26 //

27  
28 <sup>1</sup> Nothing within this Complaint should be construed as an allegation that Plaintiff is bringing this action as a private attorney general under either state or federal statutes.

Failure to Modify Existing Policies and Procedures

29. The ADA also requires reasonable modifications in policies, practices, or procedures, when necessary to afford such goods, services, facilities, or accommodations to individuals with disabilities, unless the entity can demonstrate that making such modifications would fundamentally alter their nature. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(ii).

30. Here, Defendants violated the ADA by failing to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices, or procedures at the Facility, when these modifications were necessary to afford (and would not fundamentally alter the nature of) these goods, services, facilities, or accommodations.

Failure to Maintain Accessible Features

31. Defendants additionally violated the ADA by failing to maintain in operable working condition those features of the Facility that are required to be readily accessible to and usable by persons with disabilities.

32. Such failure by Defendants to maintain the Facility in an accessible condition was not an isolated or temporary interruption in service or access due to maintenance or repairs.

33. Plaintiff seeks all relief available under the ADA (i.e., injunctive relief, attorney fees, costs, legal expense) for these aforementioned violations. 42 U.S.C. § 12205.

**VII. SECOND CLAIM**

**Unruh Act**

34. Plaintiff re-pleads and incorporates by reference the allegations contained in each of the foregoing paragraphs, and incorporates them herein as if separately re-pled.

35. California Civil Code § 51 states, in part, that: All persons within the jurisdiction of this state are entitled to the full and equal accommodations, advantages, facilities, privileges, or services in all business establishments of every kind whatsoever.

36. California Civil Code § 51.5 also states, in part that: No business establishment of any kind whatsoever shall discriminate against any person in this state because of the disability of the person.

1 37. California Civil Code § 51(f) specifically incorporates (by reference) an  
2 individual's rights under the ADA into the Unruh Act.

3 38. Defendants' aforementioned acts and omissions denied the physically disabled  
4 public – including Plaintiff – full and equal accommodations, advantages, facilities, privileges  
5 and services in a business establishment (because of their physical disability).

6 39. These acts and omissions (including the ones that violate the ADA) denied,  
7 aided or incited a denial, or discriminated against Plaintiff by violating the Unruh Act.

8 40. Plaintiff was damaged by Defendants' wrongful conduct, and seeks statutory  
9 minimum damages of \$4,000 for each offense.

10 41. Plaintiff also seeks to enjoin Defendants from violating the Unruh Act (and  
11 ADA), and recover reasonable attorneys' fees and costs incurred under California Civil Code  
12 § 52(a).

### 13 **VIII. THIRD CLAIM**

#### 14 **Denial of Full and Equal Access to Public Facilities**

15 42. Plaintiff re-pleads and incorporates by reference the allegations contained in  
16 each of the foregoing paragraphs, and incorporates them herein as if separately re-pled.

17 43. Health and Safety Code § 19955(a) states, in part, that: California public  
18 accommodations or facilities (built with private funds) shall adhere to the provisions of  
19 Government Code § 4450.

20 44. Health and Safety Code § 19959 states, in part, that: Every existing (non-  
21 exempt) public accommodation constructed prior to July 1, 1970, which is altered or  
22 structurally repaired, is required to comply with this chapter.

23 45. Plaintiff alleges the Facility is a public accommodation constructed, altered, or  
24 repaired in a manner that violates Part 5.5 of the Health and Safety Code or Government Code  
25 § 4450 (or both), and that the Facility was not exempt under Health and Safety Code § 19956.

26 46. Defendants' non-compliance with these requirements at the Facility aggrieved  
27 (or potentially aggrieved) Plaintiff and other persons with physical disabilities. Accordingly,  
28 Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief and attorney fees pursuant to Health and Safety Code § 19953.



**IX. PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays judgment against Defendants, and each of them, for:

1. Injunctive relief, preventive relief, or any other relief the Court deems proper.
2. Statutory minimum damages under section 52(a) of the California Civil Code according to proof.
3. Attorneys' fees, litigation expenses, and costs of suit.<sup>2</sup>
4. Interest at the legal rate from the date of the filing of this action.
5. For such other and further relief as the Court deems proper.

Dated: 9/27/2021

MOORE LAW FIRM, P.C.

/s/ Tanya E. Moore

Tanya E. Moore  
Attorney for Plaintiff  
Jose Trujillo

---

<sup>2</sup> This includes attorneys' fees under California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5.

**VERIFICATION**

I, JOSE TRUJILLO, am the plaintiff in the above-entitled action. I have read the foregoing Complaint and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe them to be true.

I verify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated: 9/27/2021

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jose Trujillo

I attest that the original signature of the person whose electronic signature is shown above is maintained by me, and that his concurrence in the filing of this document and attribution of his signature was obtained.

/s/ Tanya E. Moore  
Tanya E. Moore, Attorney for  
Plaintiff, Jose Trujillo